



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

Observations on Taboo.—A taboo is an interdiction, and a tabooed object is an interdicted object; but, while this is true, it is to be carefully noted that the converse of the propositions do not hold good. A taboo differs from an interdiction in several very important respects: (a) In its pure and primitive form no explanation is ever given of the action of taboo; such explanations grow up at a later date, but originally they do not exist. We have a saying: "Speak softly in the death-chamber, *for to do otherwise is to seem lacking in respect for the dead.*" The primitive form of observing this taboo consisted not only in speaking softly, or not at all, in the presence of the dead, but in precipitate flight from such presence. No reason was sought or given; to speak in the presence of the dead was to invite death, and the presence of the dead was actively avoided, and no questions were asked. (b) The punishment for violation of taboo always follows as the direct effect of the transgression without the intervention of a third party. The commandment given to Adam not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge is a true taboo in this respect. No third party is to intervene to inflict the punishment; the statement runs simply: "If you eat you die." (c) In the case of the taboo the nature of the danger is unknown, and the object of the prohibition is to protect from this unknown danger. When the ark of the covenant was shaken by the stumbling of the oxen, and Uzzah, putting forth his hand to stay it, was stricken dead, there was no hint given of the nature of the force by which he was killed. Jehovah was wroth, and he was killed.

The tabooed object is always leagued with a reservoir of mysterious and awful power, and the slightest infraction of the taboo brings down upon the offender all its destructive force. Only in case the offender is himself leagued with an opposite and equivalent power may he break the prohibition with impunity. Taboo has represented the element of authority in the growth of civilization; without this element civilization would have been impossible, for it has always required that certain things be considered, for the time at least, inviolable. Modified by reason and with its field greatly restricted, taboo exists among us today and performs an important function; let him who doubts examine the practical workings of certain types of religion and of family government. —SALOMON REINACH, "Quelques observations sur le Tabou," in *L'Anthropologie*, Tome XI, No. 4. R. G. K.

The Sociological Work of Guyau.—In reviewing the progress of sociology in France during the nineteenth century Guyau must be conceded an eniment place. At a time when such service was essential to its further development he secured for the new science the respectful attention of the learned world in France. His thorough familiarity with the work of the masters of sociological thought in other countries made him easily their most brilliant and influential expositor in his own land. Aside from this, his keen critical abilities, coupled with the inventive and philosophic nature of his mind, raised him above the rank of a mere disciple and placed him among the masters of his chosen field. Into general philosophy he introduced a movement which was well-nigh revolutionary. "For the individual," said he, "the achievement of a greatening life through and by means of his social environment is the one true end of all living. By this is to be measured the value of all activity, and upon it must rest the enduring principles of all education, morals, art, and religion." To the various social implications of this fundamental thesis Guyau devoted the major portion of his life and work. For a pedagogy conceived from this point of view the child is no longer the personification of a sullen heredity fettering the form of a living present in the mummy-cloths of a dead past. On the contrary, the personality of the child is to be regarded as that particular phase of reality wherein the fixed and rigid factors of the past become once more yielding and flexible and capable, under the powerful

influence of social suggestion, of organic relation with the new factors of the present time. For an ethics whose moral sanctions originate in the fundamental tendency of life to broaden and deepen itself indefinitely many of the perplexing problems which confront Kantian idealism and Spencerian utilitarianism alike are readily solved, or, it may be, do not exist at all. No ultimate and mysterious Absolute needs to be discovered as the source of moral obligation; egoism is no longer a sin—it has become an absurdity; the duties and obligations of traditional ethics are no more mere arbitrary commands imposed from without—they are the habits which life has wrought out in the long process of its own self-realization. To be sure, there will remain problems which such an ethics is as yet confessedly unable to solve; but these are the problems of the rare exception and not those of the common majority. In the nature of the case, such problems must always exist, and yet they must be continually yielding up their secrets to an ethics whose ability to solve them depends upon the later stages of the same process—the growth of experience—whose earlier stages are alone able to bring them to view. The beautiful is essentially social in its nature; the universal enters into it as a predominant factor. The sense of the beautiful demands for its full enjoyment the presence and sympathy of others. Egoistic pleasures are shallow and short-lived; only those enjoyments which are shared are worth while; persons swayed by one emotion are near to being moved by one will. In pedagogy, ethics, and æsthetics the fundamental fact, never to be lost sight of, is the unsatisfiable hunger of life for more life. The same fact is equally worthy of attention in the domain of religion. The infinite amplification of all life constitutes the basis of all religion. Religion expands the self of the individual till it includes the self of all others, establishes a bond among all living creatures, and speaks of life never-ending. It is true that religion in a certain sense must one day cease to exist, but there will always remain to man the fellowship born of a common origin, a common nature, and a common destiny. Thus, in showing that sociology, as the science dealing with the social relationships in which alone this tendency of life toward its own indefinite expansion can find room for full development and expression, is capable of furnishing new and more fruitful points of view for all other sciences dealing with human life, Guyau demonstrated its fundamental importance and proved its right to the best and the deepest consideration of all thoughtful men. For this service his name stands high among those who contributed to the advancement of sociology in France during the nineteenth century. —ALFRED LAMBERT, "L'œuvre sociologique de Guyau," in *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, August–September, 1900. R. G. K.

Antisemitism and Socialism.—Can a socialist or an anarchist logically be an antisemite? Ought such a one even to mingle in an antisemitic movement, in the hope of turning it from its primary end toward a result more in accord with his own aspirations? Some time ago the question would have been unnecessary, for the socialist had in view the liberation of the proletariat without distinction of race or nationality. But now the leaders of socialism are concerning themselves with the antisemitic movement in various ways. The history of the movement will, however, show its bearing upon the rise of the proletariat.

After eighteen centuries of persecution the Jew was reinstated in society by the declaration of the rights of man in 1789. Antisemitism was again stirred up by the fanaticism of Napoleon I., but came to an end with the empire. It reappeared under the monarchy of July, and took vague form in the book of Toussenel, *Les Juifs Rois de l'Epoque*. This time, it will be remembered, was one of oppression of the working classes, the time when modern industrialism arose. The second republic was too busy to meddle with the Jews, and Napoleon III. had too much need of them to abuse them. Under the existing régime, so long as the Liberals were in power the Jews were not bothered. But, beginning with the supremacy of the Opportunists in 1885, a reaction began. In 1886 appeared Drumont's *La France Juive*. It will be noted through all this history that antisemitism appeared in times of counter-revolutionary tendencies. Further, it has been most marked in the most feudal country of Europe—Austria.

Antisemitism is not so much a matter of race or of religion. It is an *economic* question. The small merchants find their business failing. Instead of attributing this to the present system of industry, they fall under the influence of the nationalist

and antisemitic leaders and cry: "A bas les Juifs!" The middle men in the commercial world desire the commerce of France to remain in their hands and fear any change of property laws. And, so under cover of a vague patriotism, they, too, join this conservative movement. The owners of real estate wish the rents of their property maintained at a high figure by a policy of national protection. Moreover, some of the bankers to whom they have hypothecated their estates are Jews. Add to this the religious and educational bias of a class descended from the landed nobility, and we have the reasons for the antisemitism of this element. And thus are gathered into one party classes of very different interests.

For the socialists and anarchists the question is likewise not one of religion or of race, since these matters are indifferent to them. Neither can they justify the prejudice upon the ground that some Jews are merchants and capitalists, for Christians and freethinkers are also merchants and capitalists. And it is against this whole class of industrial tyrants that the socialists contend. The socialists cannot join forces with the small proprietors in their struggle against the great capitalists, for the former still cling fast to property rights. Therefore, with them the socialists can find no common ground in antisemitism. In short, the socialists cannot be antisemites. On the other hand, they cannot be *philosemites*, except in so far as they recognize Jews as members of the proletariat.

As to the question of *Sionism*, our socialists are against the movement, because it would seem to be an evacuation of a goodly part of their constituency. Further, the peculiar geographical position of Palestine would oblige the colonists to engage in commerce and trade, and would thus reduce them to the rank of slaves of the present mercantile system.

As a final argument for joining forces with the antisemites is advanced the claim that the demonstrations of popular fury will prepare the people for the destruction of the industrial revolution that is to come. But, say our socialists, do not deceive yourselves. The *bourgeoisie* knows the difference between an anarchist and an antisemite. Therefore do not compromise the cause of socialism by union with the forces that make for nationalism and the preservation of the present industrial system.—"Antisémitisme et Sinaïsme" (Rapport présenté au Congrès ouvrier révolutionnaire international (Paris 1900) par le groupe des Étudiants socialistes révolutionnaires internationalistes de Paris), in *L'Humanité nouvelle*, September, 1900.

H. B. W.

Mental Derangement and Crime.—A careful investigation of statistics gathered from several penal institutions and insane asylums in Mecklenburg-Schwerin reveals certain facts regarding the relations existing between insanity and criminality in the population studied. Overlooking the practical distinction between the insane criminals and the criminally inclined insane, these facts may be briefly stated as follows: (a) The number of cases in which insanity and crime are associated is variously estimated by different authors at from 1.5 per cent. to 10 per cent. of the whole number of criminals; insanity being from five to thirty times as frequent among criminals as among the non-criminal classes. (b) Of the two great classes of crime—occasional (murder, manslaughter, arson, etc.) and habitual (thievery, bigamy, vagrancy, etc.)—it is found that the percentage of crimes connected with insanity in the first class is more than five times that in the second. The corresponding truth that a very much larger percentage of the insane than of the mentally sound are liable to commit grave crimes is clearly shown by the facts inspected. (c) The relation of the sexes to crime seems not to be materially altered, save in the case of the graver crimes, where it is true that women under the influence of insanity are more liable to commit crimes of this class than when in sound mental health; this is not true, to a corresponding degree, of the males. (d) Persons inclined to crime and insanity are less apt to marry than are normal individuals. (e) The majority of the criminal insane are of middle age and possess little or no education. (f) Imprisonment very rarely acts as the original cause of mental disorder, though there is little doubt that it is very effective in promoting the development of tendencies toward insanity. This is due to several reasons, prominent among which are solitude and improper care. (g) While the insanity found among prisoners presents certain well-marked and uniform characteristics, it is greatly to be questioned whether these are of a nature to warrant the bestowing of a special name upon

this sort of insanity. (*h*) Weak-mindedness is the form of psychic abnormality most frequently encountered among the criminal insane. (*i*) Sensory illusions, noted among the criminal insane and named in the order of frequency of occurrence, are as follows: auditory, visual, tactile, gustatory, and olfactory. The chief delusions are those of persecution, pursuit, coming freedom, and exaggerated personality. (*j*) Very few cases of feigned insanity are found. (*k*) Insane criminals are much more likely than others to attempt escape. (*l*) The chances are about one to three that an insane criminal will be recognized as such upon the occasion of his first crime and conviction.—DR. ULRICH SCHEVEN, "Geistesstörung und Verbrechen in Mecklenburg-Schwerin," in *Archiv für Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik*, 4. Band, 1., 2., 3. u. 4. Heft. R. G. K.

Socialism and Anarchism.—Great as is the danger to which society is exposed from anarchism, it is less serious than that which arises out of the temper of society toward the anarchism which it dreads.

Anarchism is not a disease, but it is a symptom of a disease, and that disease is democracy. It was in order to counteract the ravages of that disease that Hamilton and his colleagues framed the checks and counterchecks which are such a unique feature of the American constitution, and which have so admirably preserved the balance in the working of that constitution. This has been one of the main factors in the amazing progress of the United States.

We have the disease in quite as virulent a form as they have it in America. But, alas! we have not the remedy. A nation wholly abandoned to the heady lawlessness of a democracy is stricken to its very vitals with a deadly and incurable malady. Such a nation is a spectacle over which the gods might well weep with tears of pity. And such a spectacle is England today. Hence our statesmen sigh for a constitution similar to that of the United States. When Lord Salisbury, some months ago, said, "Under a constitution such as ours you have, and ever can have, no adequate guarantee that either war or any other department of government will be efficiently conducted," he put his finger on the fatally weak spot in England's armor.

Democratic government is on its trial, and it is by no means certain that it will emerge triumphantly from the test to which it is being subjected. Already it shows signs of breaking under the strain; at all events this is the case in England. If it is not true in the United States or France in the same degree, it is because those countries are really less democratic than ours.

The rock upon which democracy will shiver itself to atoms is *property*. And this is the common ground upon which socialism and anarchy meet. Anarchism says very little about property, and socialism says very little about liberty; their policy is, however, to cooperate toward undermining these two bastions, upon which the whole of civilization is founded. If these go, all goes.

At the present time in this country press, platform, Parliament, and even many of our nonconformist churches and philanthropic movements, are veritable seed-beds of socialism and anarchy, and the same remark applies with equal force to the United States. And the governments encourage rather than try to stop it.

Both in the United States and in England people who profess to understand the signs of the times and to be statesmen and leaders calmly sleep on over a slumbering volcano, which may burst into active eruption so suddenly as to overwhelm and confound those who are at ease in the midst of their luxury.—GEOFFREY LANGTOFT, in *Fortnightly Review*, October, 1900. B. F. S.